

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present case. Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein. No new matter has been added by amendments made herein.

103 Rejection

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Takahata et al. (US Patent No. 6,556,189) and further in view of Crutchfield (US Patent No. 6,556,189). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present claimed invention as are recited in Claims 1-20 are neither taught nor suggested by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Takahata et al. in further view of Crutchfield.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which is drawn to an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly. Claim 1 is reproduced below in its entirety for the convenience of the Examiner:

1. An integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly comprising:
 - a display mechanism;
 - a digitizer mechanism comprising a protective component and a digitizing element; and
 - a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and fully encloses the top and sides of said touch screen assembly that has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of said touch screen assembly,
 - wherein said digitizing element can be activated by contact made along the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure, and wherein said single piece cover enclosure forms a seal to protect said digitizer mechanism.

Independent Claims 9 and 16 recite distinguishing limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-8 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 10-15 depend from independent Claim 9, and Claims 17-20 depend from independent Claim 16 and set forth additional limitations of embodiments of the present invention.

The cited combination fails to anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 as the cited combination fails to teach or suggest limitations that are set forth in these Claims. In particular, the primary reference, Applicants' prior art Figure 1, does not teach or suggest an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of said touch screen assembly" as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations). And, the secondary references Takahata et al. and Crutchfield do not remedy the deficiencies of Applicants' prior art Figure 1.

Applicants' prior art Figure 1 shows a dissimilar touch screen assembly that clearly does not include a single piece cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses the top and both sides of the touch screen assembly and the protective film of the shown digitizer mechanism. Referring to Applicants' Figure 1, the outermost protective film 110 which is equated in the outstanding Office Action to the recited single piece cover enclosure, does not enclose the top and fully cover both sides of the touch screen

assembly shown in Figure 1. In fact, protective film 110 is limited to the area located directly above the shown digitizer mechanism (see Figure 1). Accordingly, Applicants' Figure 1 fails to teach or suggest the above noted limitations of Claims 1 and 9.

In addition, Applicants' Figure 1 does not teach or suggest "a bezel-less cover element disposed over a top surface of said digitizer mechanism that has a top surface that is coincident with the top surface of a supporting structure of said bezel-less cover element as is recited in Claim 16. Referring to Applicants' Figure 1, the top surface of the device is depicted as not being coincident with the top surface of its supporting structure. As such, this structure cannot reasonably be equated to the top surface of the recited cover element of Claim 16. Accordingly, a cover element such as is delimited in Claim 16 is not taught or suggested by Applicants' Figure 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned limitations of Claim 16 are not addressed in the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that these limitations be addressed in the next Office Action if a rejection of Claim 16 based on Applicants' Figure 1 is maintained.

Takahata et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Applicants' prior art Figure 1 that would remedy the deficiencies of Applicants' prior art Figure 1 outlined above. More specifically, Takahata et al. does not teach or suggest an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of said touch screen assembly" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claim 9 recites similar limitations).

Takahata et al. teaches a touch panel device (see abstract) that is dissimilar to embodiments of Applicants' present claimed invention. It should be noted that structure 43 of Takahata et al. is equated to the single piece cover enclosure of Claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action. However, as is discussed in Takahata et al. with reference to Fig. 9, structure 43 is a bag that is very different from the single piece cover enclosure of Applicants' Claims. In Takahata et al. as shown in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10, bag 43 encloses the touch panel component and is sealed at the side of structure 43 (see figures 9 and 10). This is very different from the single piece cover enclosure of Claims 1 and 9 that has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of the recited touch screen assembly. In Takahata et al. a single piece doesn't cover the top and sides of the shown touch screen assembly and does not have endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of the shown touch screen assembly because the endpoints of the bag are disclosed to be either sealed or fused at the right side of the assembly.

Moreover, as it regards the Fig. 11 embodiment, Takahata et al. shows in the Fig. 11, that a portion of the upper surface of the bag is partially removed. Accordingly, in the Fig. 11 embodiment, as with the Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 embodiments, it cannot be reasonably alleged that a single piece cover enclosure covers both the top and sides of the touch screen assembly and has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of the recited touch screen assembly. Consequently, the aforementioned limitations of Claims 1 and 9 are not taught or suggested by Takahata et al. to remedy the above noted deficiencies of Applicants' prior art Figure 1. Applicants respectfully submit that this is acknowledged in the outstanding Office Action at page 3 in the second paragraph.

Additionally, Takahata et al. does not teach or suggest “a bezel-less cover element disposed over a top surface of said digitizer mechanism that has a top surface that is coincident with the top surface of a supporting structure of said bezel-less cover element” as is recited in Claim 16. Referring to Takahata et al. Figs. 1-4, the cover element 6 is shown as being affixed to the top of its supporting structure 8. It should be noted that the cover element is shown and described as being disposed in this manner for the embodiments shown in Figs. 1-4 without contradiction. Accordingly, it is clear that Takahata et al. does not disclose a bezel-less cover element that has a top surface that is coincident with the top surface of a supporting structure of the bezel-less cover element. Consequently, this limitation of Claim 16 is not taught or suggested by Takahata et al. to remedy above noted deficiencies of Applicants’ prior art Figure 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned limitations of Claim 16 are not addressed in the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that these limitations be addressed in the next Office Action if a rejection of Claim 16 based on Takahata et al. is maintained.

Crutchfield does not teach or suggest a modification of Applicants’ prior art and Takahata et al. that would remedy the deficiencies of Applicants’ prior art and Takahata et al. discussed above. In particular, Crutchfield does not teach or suggest an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes “a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of said touch screen assembly” as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations).

As understood by Applicants, Crutchfield discloses a digitizer tablet that has a high permeability grid shield. As a part of the disclosed digitizer tablet, Crutchfield discloses a conductive layer 36 that is equated to the recited single piece cover enclosure in the outstanding Office Action. However, conductive member 36 is shown to extend underneath the digitizer tablet. This is clearly different from the recited single piece cover enclosure of Applicants' Claims that has endpoints that are coincident with a bottom surface of the touch screen assembly. Accordingly, as conductive member 36 is clearly structured differently from the recited single piece cover enclosure of Applicants' Claims, conductive member 36 cannot reasonably be equated with the recited single piece cover enclosure that is delimited in Applicants' Claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that based on Applicants' aforementioned review of Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al., and Crutchfield nowhere therein is the above discussed limitations of Claims 1, 9 and 16 taught or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of Applicants' present claimed invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 and Takahata et al. either alone or in combination.

Dependent claims such as Claim 2 recite additional examples of non-obvious subject matter. As it regards Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claim 9 recites similar limitations) and further includes the

limitations “wherein said single piece cover enclosure is constructed using in mold decoration” as is set forth in Claim 2 (Claim 17 recites similar limitations). .

As it regards Claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claim 9 recites similar limitations) and further includes the limitations “wherein a soft thermoplastic outer film is coupled to said top film of said digitizer mechanism by in mold decoration to form said single piece cover enclosure” as is set forth in Claim 3 (Claims 10 and 19 recites similar limitations).

As it regards Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claim 9 recites similar limitations) and further includes the limitations “wherein finger pressure on the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure can be used to activate said digitizer mechanism” as is set forth in Claim 4.

As it regards Claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations) and further includes the limitations “wherein stylus pressure on the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure may be used to activate said digitizer mechanism” as is set forth in Claim 5 (Claim 12 recites similar limitations).

As it regards Claim 6, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations) and further includes the limitations "wherein said single piece cover comprises a mylar polycarbonate material" as is set forth in Claim 6.

As it regards Claim 7, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations) and further includes the limitations "said soft thermoplastic film has sufficient deflection under external pressure to active said digitizer mechanism" as is set forth in Claim 7 (Claims 14 and 20 recites similar limitations).

As it regards Claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 1 (Claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations) and further includes the limitations "wherein said single piece cover enclosure for said display mechanism and said digitizer mechanism is constructed with a flat outer top surface free of any indentation" as is set forth in Claim 8 (Claim 15 recites similar limitations).

As it regards Claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Crutchfield is an integrated

enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 9 (Claim 1 recites similar limitations) and further includes the limitations "wherein said single piece cover enclosure is a soft thermoplastic outerfilm that is coupled to said protective component of said digitizer mechanism and to said supporting structure" as is set forth in Claim 10.

As it regards Claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Cruthchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 9 (Claim 1 recites similar limitations) and further includes the limitations "wherein finger pressure on the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure may be used to activate said digitizer mechanism" as is set forth in Claim 11.

As it regards Claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1, Takahata et al. and Cruthchfield is an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly taught or suggested that includes the above discussed limitations of Claim 9 (Claim 1 recites similar limitations) and further includes the limitations "wherein said digitizing element of said digitizer mechanism is a resistive type digitizing element" as is set forth in Claim 13 (Claim 18 recites similar limitations).

Because of the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1, 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper and that Claims 1, 9 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10-15 dependent on Claim 9 and Claims 17-20

dependent on Claim 16 are likewise in condition for allowance at least as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending Claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Reginald A. Ratliff at (408) 938-9060.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 3/19, 2008

Reginald A. Ratliff
Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No.: 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060